

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings correct typographical errors in FIGs. 1, 3, and 4.

Attachments: Three (3) Replacement Sheets (FIGs. 1, 3, and 4)
 Three (3) Annotated Sheets (FIGs. 1, 3, and 4)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 (“Amendment”), Applicants amend paragraphs [0018], [0019], [0030], [0032], [0033], [0037], [0048], [0049], [0059], and [0060] of the specification in order to correct typographical errors and/or improve clarity; and amend the drawings in order to correct typographical errors in FIGs. 1, 3, and 4. Applicants also amend claim 1 to recite, inter alia, “repeating, at least once, the filtering, deriving, updating, and comparing such that the updating and comparing do not occur for the at least one of the filter cells that is eliminated from having to be updated”; amend claim 4 to recite, inter alia, “repeating, at least once, the filtering, deriving, updating, and comparing, such that the updating and comparing do not occur for the filter cells that do not have coefficients to be updated”; amend claim 6 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficients of filter cells that are not selected are not updated by the update means” and “wherein the coefficients of the filter cells that are not selected are not compared to the threshold”; amend claim 10 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficient updating circuit does not determine the updated coefficient value or compare the updated coefficient value for filter cells in which the updated coefficient value is set to zero”; and amend claim 11 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficient updating circuit does not determine the updated coefficient value or compare the updated coefficient value for filter cells that do not have coefficients to be updated”; all in order to better define the claimed invention. Additionally, Applicants make other amendments to

claims 1-11 in order to correct typographical errors and/or improve clarity.

Further, Applicants add new claims 16-20. No new matter is introduced.

Prior to entry of the Amendment, claims 1-15 were pending in the application. After entry of the Amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2; and rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,483,872 B2 to Nguyen ("Nguyen").

The Examiner also stated that claims 2 and 7-9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Additionally, the Examiner stated that claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statements that claims 2, 4, 5, 7-11, 13, and 15 would be allowable.

Foreign Priority

Applicants note that the Form PTOL-326 in the Office Action mailed on June 3, 2008, does not indicate the status of the claim for foreign priority. Specifically, none of the blocks under item 12 is checked.

Applicants request that the Examiner indicate the complete status of the claim for foreign priority in the next paper mailed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”).

Amendments to the Specification

As discussed above, Applicants amend paragraphs [0018], [0019], [0030], [0032], [0033], [0037], [0048], [0049], [0059], and [0060] of the specification in order to correct typographical errors and/or improve clarity.

Amendments to the Drawings

As also discussed above, Applicants amend the drawings in order to correct typographical errors in FIGs. 1, 3, and 4.

Status of Drawings

Applicants note that the Form PTOL-326 in the Office Action mailed on June 3, 2008, does not indicate the status of the drawings filed on September 11, 2003.

Applicants request that the Examiner indicate the complete status of the drawings—including the drawings filed with this Amendment—in the next paper mailed by the USPTO.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

As discussed above, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite, inter alia, “repeating, at least once, the filtering, deriving, updating, and comparing such that the updating and comparing do not occur for the at least one of the filter cells that is eliminated from having to be updated”; amend claim 4 to recite,

inter alia, “repeating, at least once, the filtering, deriving, updating, and comparing, such that the updating and comparing do not occur for the filter cells that do not have coefficients to be updated”; amend claim 6 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficients of filter cells that are not selected are not updated by the update means” and “wherein the coefficients of the filter cells that are not selected are not compared to the threshold”; amend claim 10 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficient updating circuit does not determine the updated coefficient value or compare the updated coefficient value for filter cells in which the updated coefficient value is set to zero”; and amend claim 11 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficient updating circuit does not determine the updated coefficient value or compare the updated coefficient value for filter cells that do not have coefficients to be updated”.

Applicants submit that these amendments obviate the Office Action’s rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

As discussed above, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite, inter alia, “repeating, at least once, the filtering, deriving, updating, and comparing such that the updating and comparing do not occur for the at least one of the filter cells that is eliminated from having to be updated”; and amend claim 6 to recite, inter alia, “wherein the coefficients of filter cells that are not selected are not updated by the update means” and “wherein the coefficients of the filter cells that are not selected are not compared to the threshold”.

Applicants submit that these amendments obviate the Office Action's rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

New Claims 16-20

Applicants submit that new claims 16-19 are patentable over Nguyen for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which claims 16-19 directly or indirectly depend.

Applicants also submit that new claim 20 is patentable over Nguyen for at least the same reasons as claim 4, from which claim 20 directly depends.

Request for Reconsideration and Allowance

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-20 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Director of the USPTO is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
703.668.8000

JAC/LFG/hcw

FIG. 1




FIG. 2

